

REMARKS

Claims 21 and 6 are in the case.

All remaining claims other than Claims 21 and 6 have been cancelled in order to focus the issues squarely on the method claimed in Claim 21.

The Examiner's objection to Claim 21 has been remedied as suggested by the Examiner.

The rejection of Claims 21 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Lalande in view of McKillip, Behnen and Good is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in any of the secondary references that would suggest the use of the elements for which the secondary references are cited, in Lalande's structure. Specifically, McKillip does not teach the use of a UV-transparent carrier sheet. McKillip's glassine layer is simply a separator between two layers of hot melt adhesive. Note that the upper adhesive in McKillip adheres to the label, which will be used as a shipping label. This is the exact opposite of the frangible connection between the carrier sheet and the label that Applicant intends to accomplish. Consequently, McKillip fails to make any suggestion that a UV-transparent material would be of any use as a carrier sheet in Applicant's laminate.

Behnen uses a UV-curable adhesive (in a laminate very different from Applicant's) to form a permanent bond between the card stock and the lamination layer 28 (last sentence of par. 0050). Again, this is the exact opposite of what Applicant is trying to accomplish. Behnen uses a UV-curable adhesive only to prevent absorption of the adhesive into the card stock (last sentence of par. 0049). Behnen's fugitive (but not frangible) bond is created by a pressure-sensitive adhesive (first sentence of par. 0053).

Good is cited as teaching the separation of a label into major and minor portions. The Examiner appears to dismiss as obvious the distinction that Applicant's minor portion remains on the carrier sheet while Good's does not. Applicant respectfully submits that the retention of the minor portion would not be obvious at all to a person cognizant of Good. Removing the minor part from the carrier sheet together with the major part may make the frangibility of the adhesive a little less critical, but it would force the user to perform an additional step when the tag is being used.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the purported combination of Lalande with the three secondary references is no more than the aggregation, in hindsight, of elements whose relation or utility to each other the prior art fails to teach. It does not suggest Applicant's recognition that there is an advantage in making the carrier sheet of a two-layer tag laminate from a UV-transparent material and to cure a UV-curable adhesive therethrough to where it provides a dry frangible bond between the

carrier sheet and the label that allows the label's major portion to be removed from the carrier sheet while leaving the minor portion behind with the carrier sheet waste.

As for Claim 6, the cited thickness limitation provides for sufficient UV-transparency while still allowing the UV-transparent sheet sufficient integrity to serve as a carrier sheet. None of the references concern themselves with that point.

A Notice of Allowance is now respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Harry G. Weissenberger", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Harry G. Weissenberger
Reg. No. 18,784

"Express Mail" mailing label number:

Date of Deposit:

This paper is being deposited on the date indicated above with the United States Postal Service pursuant to 37 CFR 1.10, and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Box 1450, Alexandria, V.A. 22313-1450.

Karen A Springer
Signature

